

Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge

2015 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



New Jersey



JUNE 2016



Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge
Annual Performance Report
CFDA Number: 84.412

New Jersey

2015

Due: February 29, 2016

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: December 31, 2016

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0713. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0713. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E320, Washington, DC 20202-6200.

Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

B(1) Developing and Adopting a Common, Statewide TQRIS

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

B(3) Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs

B(4) Promoting Access to High-Quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

D(1) Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and Progression of Credentials

D(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in Improving their Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities.

E(1) Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130049

2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of New Jersey

3. Grantee Address PO Box 001

City: Trenton

State: New Jersey Zip: 08625

4. Project Director Name: Vincent J. Costanza

Title: Executive Director

Phone #: (609)777-0567 Ext.: Fax #:

Email: vincent.costanza@doe.state.nj.us

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2015 To: 12/31/2015

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): From: 07/01/2011 To: 06/30/2016

Approving Federal agency: ☒ ED ☐ HHS ☐ Other Specify other:

(Submit current indirect cost rate agreement with this report.)

Executive Summary

For the reporting year, please provide a summary of your State's (1) accomplishments, (2) lessons learned, (3) challenges, and (4) strategies you will implement to address those challenges.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The cross agency RTT-ELC team has continued to implement the eleven projects that our federal partners have approved in New Jersey's Scope of Work (SOW). After Year 2 of implementation, the majority of tasks within each of the projects have been completed within the approved time-frames of the SOW. Amongst the various activities and tasks, the three initiatives below stand out as Year 2 accomplishments.

Project 9: Preschool-3rd Grade Initiative

The New Jersey Department of Education, in partnership with Rutgers University, Graduate School of Education (GSE) and the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) have developed *First through Third Grade Implementation Guidelines* with funding provided by the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant. The purpose of these guidelines is to outline best practices in the primary years of schooling and to assist educators with fusing practices that are both academically rigorous and developmentally appropriate. These guidelines, which can be accessed here <http://www.nj.gov/education/ece/rttt/ImplementationGuidelines1-3.pdf>, are the work product of a collaboration that spans local school districts, State & Federal agencies, and higher education.

Over the past year, feedback from national experts provided insight into the framework, content, and presentation of the information in the guidelines document. A field test of the draft guidelines was also held with practitioners and leaders in the field. The focus groups in NJ yielded valuable information about content, format, and professional learning, and roll out into NJ school districts. Revisions to many sections was completed along with re-structuring of the document based on the abundance of feedback. In addition, the research coordinator of this project visited several classrooms to take photographs to support both the guidelines document and to begin preparation for the professional learning series.

In year three, a video series as well as professional development modules will be developed to support implementation of these guidelines. These guidelines will be placed in a robust system of supports that are positioned with an eye toward systems change. We know this guidelines document alone is not sufficient to elicit the changes we want to see in the primary years of schooling. In the words of Michael Fullan, "never send a changed individual into an unchanged culture."

Two additional activities that were started this year and will contribute greatly to the systemic supports for the Preschool- 3rd Grade Initiative are listed below:

- Higher Ed Inventory of Principal Preparation Programs- This will survey higher education institutions with principal certification programs in NJ to determine preparedness for leading buildings with early elementary classes.
- Approaches to Learning, Kindergarten to Grade 3 Guide- This will describe core standards and indicators that define Approaches to Learning in K-3 settings, while providing numerous examples to assist educators in supporting these skills.

Project 8: Data Systems

This past year has been a productive year for the data project as several project milestones and deliverables have been met or are in progress. The work that follows below is evidence that moving the data project from a year one challenge to a Year 2 accomplishment is a warranted move.

Major accomplishments this year include:

- Project Management: Completed Project Planning (together with the completion of a Work Breakdown Structure, which is continually monitored and updated), a Project Charter, Project Management Plan, and implementation of the NJ-EASEL SharePoint where all project documentation is stored and available to the NJ-EASEL project team.
- Data Governance: Data Governance Plan (DGP) completed and executed by 3 of the 4 NJ-EASEL participating agencies. The DGP includes the Data Governance Model of the NJ-EASEL project teams, their roles and responsibilities; Data Sharing Agreements (DSA) between the agencies are in progress with one fully executed

DSA between NJ DOE as the lead agency and NJ's Office of Information Technology (OIT).

- Requirements Definition & Analysis: Completed Joint Application Development (JAD) Requirements Sessions for Reporting to capture user priorities, as well as JADs with each of the 4 agencies resulting in a Crosswalk Analysis document reflecting the systems and corresponding data elements for each of the Key Questions and Objectives, Source Data Analysis Sessions are in progress providing a more in depth understanding and clarification of the required data elements for data mapping and analysis.

- Design: Completed NJ-EASEL Conceptual Systems Design, as well as Logical and Physical Data Model Designs for all NJ DOE systems. Initiated Logical Data Model Designs for NJ DCF, NJ DHS and NJ DOH systems.

- Development & Testing: Completed development of Source System Interfaces for Phase 1 systems.

Project 6: Family Engagement and Health Connections

This project is one of the most robust projects in the grant as there are major activities spread through all of the participating state agencies. The following two activities have made significant progress over the last year.

First, the County Councils for Young Children (CCYC), which are run through the Department of Children and Families (DCF), is a statewide network of local councils with representation of parents/families, community residents and local community agencies/stakeholders that work together to support families as leaders as they map out the course of their child's success. The CCYCs are now operating in all 21 counties of New Jersey and information on the local activities for each of the councils can be accessed here <http://www.state.nj.us/education/ece/njcyc/county/>.

The CCYCs have a direct link to the New Jersey Council for Young Children through the Family and Community Engagement Committee. Elected members of the CCYCs have participated in several Family and Community Engagement Committee meetings, provided guidance, and gave input on the development on the Family Engagement Standards, which is also an activity of RTT-ELC. All 21 CCYCs now have a designated coordinator and basic structure in place --Steering Committee, Health, Education and Safety Workgroups, and General Membership meetings. Committees/workgroups are co-led by community and parent stakeholders.

Next, the NJ Department of Health expanded a core health component, Central Intake Hubs (CIH), to improve access for parents and families to needed infant/child health services and supports in six previously un-served counties. These county-level hubs function as a single point of entry to simplify the referral and linkage process to community-based services. Now operating in all 21 counties, CIH helps to build stronger connections and communication, and support health literacy between parents, health care providers, and early learning programs.

The Central Intake Hubs continue to promote their services in their communities by meeting with collaborating agencies and forming new partnerships in their communities. An example in Hunterdon County, the Central Intake Specialist and the Community Liaison attended the annual winter coat drive at the YMCA where they were able to raise awareness of Central Intake while helping out with the YMCA annual event reaching hundreds of parents and children.

New agencies are invited to participate in their local Community Advisory Board meetings, which the staff can learn more about the services and the meetings are held quarterly. These Advisory Board meetings are to be 25% consumer driven.

The CIH have been continuing their efforts to market their central intake services to county providers and implementing creative strategies to reach their targeted benchmarks.

Each CIH conducts follow-up with clients via a phone to ensure the clients are engaged to service and or programs. Documentation is to be documented in the Single Point of Entry Client Tracking (SPECT) data system and the Central Intake Specialist manages the data.

Health care, nutrition, and concrete services, (e.g., clothing, emergency shelter, housing assistance) continue to be the highest need seen through the Central Intake process beside the Home Visiting referrals.

LESSONS LEARNED

New Jersey entered this work with a structure in place that created the foundation to accomplish the work approved by our federal partners in the SOW. The Interdepartmental Planning Group (IPG) is the primary implementation arm for programs and policies affecting young children in the state. It includes the administrators (under the Commissioners) from each of the state's departments with oversight of programs and services related to children from prenatal to age eight, and other relevant agencies. This group considers the feasibility of program and policy recommendations, makes plans for implementation, presents those plans to the various agency commissioners, and ultimately carries out the plans while working in close collaboration with all other relevant state organizations and agencies. Although New Jersey entered the RTT-ELC work in round three, we have been working at many of the projects for some time, because of this IPG structure (e.g., NJKEA & GNJK). What is clear is that the work outlined in RTT-ELC would not have been possible without the strength of the *cross-agency relationship*, made manifest in the work of the IPG.

In addition to the relationship of the agency partners, making an early *commitment to human capital* by filling positions required in the grant as soon as possible has proven fruitful. For instance, we can attribute the Year 2 accomplishments in Project 8: Data Systems to having dedicated staff that focus on and accomplish the requisite tasks. It is hard to imagine the administration of such an initiative without a team dedicated to the rollout and coordination needed for the work to be successful.

Lastly, an important lesson learned was the attention needed for *sustainability* issues early in the life of the grant. It is important to all partners, (agency partners and beyond) that we are not merely “four-year friends.” The work of the grant is extensive and needs significant planning to be sustained. Although the entire sustainability picture is not yet complete, we expect to spend considerable time in year three working on sustainability.

While there have been many lessons learned during the first two years of implementation, a focus on *cross-agency relations*, a determination to get the “right people on the bus” by *focusing on human capital* and filling positions with quality individuals quickly, and an immediate effort to *plan for sustainability*, have been the biggest lesson learned.

CHALLENGES

New Jersey has faced three significant challenges during the second year of implementation that were associated with the following projects:

- Project 2: Aligned Training and Professional Development
- Project 3: GNJK Rollout and Incentives Administration
- Project 10: Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA)

Project 2: Aligned Training and Professional Development

Challenges arose from a contractual change with the entity coordinating the professional development associated with Grow NJ Kids (GNJK). The contractual change was needed because of concerns with staffing, availability of training, and the creation of a sustainable training plan.

Project 3: GNJK Rollout and Incentives Administration

This second challenge is associated with the first as accessible and affordable training *is* a major incentive of participation in GNJK. Given the difficulties with the coordination of training that precipitated a contractual change, we experienced lower than projected participation in GNJK.

Project 10: Kindergarten Entry Assessment (NJKEA)

Lastly, although we trained a total of 703 teachers and 233 additional district level administrators across 49 districts in year two, we experienced trouble with the vendor, who transitioned to a new user platform this year, which allowed the tool to be expanded through third grade. Previously, the tool had stopped at kindergarten. However, this platform switch caused a great deal of user dissatisfaction and may affect our rollout numbers in year three.

Although we correctly categorize these projects as Year 2 challenges, the progress that each state agency made within the three projects listed above is evidence of the commitment, hard work, and shared vision that guides each state agency. Furthermore, considering that we realized progress in each of these projects despite the

challenges that were experienced is a success in its own right. In the face of training challenges, programs were still enrolled in GNJK. In the midst of contractual adjustments, necessary trainings for all sectors of the workforce that implement GNJK still occurred. In light of the assessment anxiety experienced by many school districts throughout the state, our KEA expanded an age-appropriate and whole-child assessment system to more teachers, administrators, and families.

STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES

The strategies to address the three challenges described above draw from the approaches detailed in our lessons learned. Namely, we have looked to personnel and the strength of our IPG relationship to address pitfalls associated with implementing the grant.

Implementing Project 2: Aligned Training and Professional Development and Project 3: GNJK Rollout and Incentives Administration will now be fully coordinated by a lead at the Department of Human Services who will establish a team to work closely with each agency and utilize existing contracts where possible. As we reach the halfway mark of the RTT-ELC grant, efforts that help all agencies focus on the sustainability of projects is of the utmost importance. As we seek to broaden the scope of training and maximize resources, leveraging existing contracts in each of the state agencies will not only assist with ensuring that our efforts are sustainable, but will help to coordinate services as well. Furthermore, the coordination of training that will be housed under one agency is expected to have a positive impact on GNJK participation and incentives spending as providers have been reluctant to participate given the concerns with training.

As a strategy to address challenges with implementing KEA, we have worked closely with the vendor as the vendor has transitioned to a new platform provider. Weekly meetings with the vendor that include updates on the system performance have provided us with the confidence that the system progress is appropriate to keep up any increases in NJKEA enrollment.

Successful State Systems

Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State (Section A(3) of Application)

Governance Structure

Please provide any relevant information and updates related to the governance structure for the RTT-ELC State Plan (specifically, please include information on the organizational structure for managing the grant, and the governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, State Advisory Council, and Participating State Agencies).

As submitted in the RTT-ELC grant application, *Executive Order 77* - In 2011, Governor Chris Christie established the Early Learning Commission (ELC), to convene the four commissioners of DOE, DCF, DOH, DHS and the chair of the NJCYC to promote the coordination of programs and funding. The Executive Order also led to the creation of the Interdepartmental Planning Group (IPG), comprised of the administrators and senior staff from the four state agencies, whose role is to consider the NJCYC's recommendations, make plans for implementation, and carry out the plans within the RTT-ELC grant.

Stakeholder Involvement

Describe State progress in involving representatives from Participating Programs, Early Childhood Educators or their representatives, parents and families, including parents and families of Children with High Needs, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of the activities carried out under the grant.

In order to support the implementation of RTT-ELC, the IPG established broad-based involvement of stakeholders (e.g., higher education partners and faith-based community). Such a diverse coalition is evidenced by the diverse listings of presentation delivered to various constituencies throughout the state during the second year of the grant. For instance, presentations were scheduled with major stakeholder groups, such as the New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children, New Jersey Association of School Administrators, Public School Superintendents' Roundtables, LEA Dyslexia Working Group, Early Childhood Supervisors, New Jersey Head Start Association, New Jersey Presidents' Council, the New Jersey Faith-Based Advisory Council as well as various other stakeholder groups.

In the second year of implementation, the RTT-ELC team plans implemented a communication plan that was aimed at delivering regular updates on the progress of the RTT-ELC implementation. Regularly scheduled RTT-ELC newsletters were designed to provide project updates to stakeholders throughout that state and country. Year 2 newsletters can be accessed here <http://www.state.nj.us/education/ece/rttt/newsletter/>

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.

A3079/S2766, was signed into law by the Governor on November 9, 2015. This law prohibits administration of standardized assessments in kindergarten through second grade.

Although it is not clear what A3079/S2766 specifically prohibits at this time, the bill states the following:

“A commercially-developed standardized assessment shall not include diagnostic and formative assessments used by teaching staff members to identify particular student learning needs or the need for special services, or to modify instructional strategies to improve an individual [student] student' learning.”

Considering the anxious assessment environment that exists in many of our school districts, there was initial concern that our kindergarten entry assessment would fit in the prohibited category. However, since we are using a formative assessment that is designed to assist teachers as they modify their instructional strategies, we were able to address the concern in our communication efforts.

Participating State Agencies

Describe any changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan.

No changes to report.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).

During this reporting year of RTT-ELC implementation, has the State made progress in ***developing or revising*** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards?

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- ☒ State-funded preschool programs
- ☒ Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- ☒ Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- ☒ Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- ☒ Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
 - ☒ Center-based
 - ☒ Family Child Care

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- ☒ Early Learning and Development Standards
- ☒ A Comprehensive Assessment System
- ☒ Early Childhood Educator Qualifications
- ☒ Family Engagement Strategies
- ☒ Health Promotion Practices
- ☒ Effective Data Practices

The State has made progress in ensuring that (please check all that apply):

- ☒ TQRIS Program Standards are measurable
- ☒ TQRIS Program Standards meaningfully differentiate program quality levels
- ☒ TQRIS Program Standards reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children
- ☒ The TQRIS is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Describe progress made during the reporting year in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

Over the past grant year, January 1, 2015-December 31, 2015, Grow NJ Kids solidified its rating process. The rating partner, William Paterson University, developed three (3) different rating readiness documents to meet the needs of providers a part of the QRIS. Specific pathways were created for NAEYC accredited programs and Early/Head Start Programs. Both took into consideration the current structures for accreditation and program monitoring. This re-enforced alignment with both program models and has encouraged participation by both program types. The rating process is both a portfolio review and onsite observation. A point system was developed for each level of the TQRIS and provides an opportunity for programs to implement systematic and systemic change.

Furthermore, the framework and processes of Grow NJ Kids has developed and efficiencies were created. The online enrollment for went live in 2014, but technical issues occurred and since have been addressed. It is must easier for programs to enroll. In late 2015, Directors' Orientation was moved to an online format. This allows programs to go through the training in the comfort of their program. In July 2015, four (4) regional technical assistance centers were created. These centers are charged with providing intensive technical assistance based on the needs of the program. This has allowed for NJ to move to a multi-tiered approach to assist programs through the process more efficiently and effectively.

Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)

Describe progress made during the reporting year in promoting participation in the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

As of December 31, 2015, there were a total 600 center-based programs and 45 family child care providers served by Grow NJ Kids. Approximately 580 programs, 20 programs withdrew, and 45 family child care providers are actively participating in Grow NJ Kids. Over the course of this past year, the Grow NJ Kids team has developed a video series that is used for recruitment as well as incorporated the video series in the new on-line directors' orientation. In addition, the team has presented at regional provider meetings, conferences, and other events that early care and education providers participate at. In addition, the team hosted monthly informational webinar sessions for interested providers were able to learn more about Grow NJ Kids.

Furthermore, in July 2015, Grow NJ Kids hosted a meeting with the Test Drive Programs, these were the first 56 programs to pilot Grow NJ Kids, to unveil the rating system. It was also decided to encourage programs to test the rating process that a one-time stipend would be provided to the first 100 programs who goes through the rating process.

In addition, a curriculum showcase and developmental screening showcase was hosted to assist programs the decision making process on what tool and curriculum would be best to meet their program needs.

Lastly, the first round of the multi-year communication campaign launched. Bus sides, billboards, revamped website, posted, and mini commercial shown in pediatric offices were distributed in the fall of 2015.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

In the table, provide data on the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in the State's TQRIS by type of Early Learning and Development Program. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.

Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	13	2.2%	132	22.1%	251	42%	370	62%	489	81.9%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	5	3.3%	38	19.2%	76	38.4%	114	57.6%	152	76.8%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	35	10%	70	20%	105	30%	140	40%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	26	1.1%	143	6.1%	260	11.1%	377	16.1%	494	21.1%
Other 1	0	0%	38	19.2%	76	38.4%	114	57.6%	152	76.8%
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs									
Other 2	1	1.8%	6	10.9%	11	20%	16	29.1%	21	38.2%
<i>Describe:</i>	Private Schools for the Disabled									
Other 3	0	0%	30	1.4%	80	3.8%	130	6.2%	180	8.6%
<i>Describe:</i>	Family Child Care Centers receiving CCDF funds									
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows

Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 4	11	0.5%	54	2.4%	99	4.4%	144	6.4%	189	8.4%
<i>Describe:</i>	Other licensed center and family child care sites									
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.

Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	597	13	2.2%	597	159	26.6%	597	130	22%						
<i>Specify:</i>	State-funded Preschool (former Abbott)														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	150	5	3.3%	150	40	26.6%	150	68	45%						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	350	0	0%	350	11	3.1%	350	18	5%						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,342	26	1.1%	2,342	268	11.44%	2,441	241	9.8%						
Other 1	198	0	0%	198	8	4%	198	7	4%						
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs														
Other 2	55	1	1.8%	55	1	1.8%	55	0	0%						
<i>Describe:</i>	Private Schools for the Disabled														
Other 3	2,100	0	0%	2,100	36	1.71%	1,587	45	2.8%						
<i>Describe:</i>	Family Child Care Centers receiving CCDF funds														

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows

Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
Other 4	2,258	11	0.5%	2,258	114	5.04%	3,934	196	5%						
<i>Describe:</i>	Other licensed center and family child care sites														
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Data Notes

Indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

State-Funded (former Abbott) includes special education programs and related services for children with disabilities funded through IDEA Part B and 619 funds and special education state funds. To prevent duplication these sites are not included in the count for IDEA Part B programs.

IDEA Part C Early Intervention Programs (EIP) is not included in the above because NJ does not provide Part C center-based specific settings. NJ early intervention services for eligible children and families are provided in “natural environments” including home and community settings. However, Part C provider agencies and practitioners will continue to receive training on Grow NJ Kids and the Birth to Three Standards.

All early learning programs funded by Title I of ESEA are included within the State Preschool Program. Baseline data are estimated based on the Grow NJ Kids pilot.

At this time, the actual numbers of participating programs in Grow NJ Kids are duplicated because a large number of programs enrolled fall into multiple programs types (i.e., have multiple funding streams).

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.

In year three of the grant, the Grow NJ Kids team will continue to target outreach efforts towards the private schools for the disabled, Part B-619 programs, and other district programs. We have seen over year two of the grant the preschool expansion program and the Head Start Child Care Partnership programs enrolled. The team will continue to host monthly informational sessional via webinar, attend conferences and directors meetings.

Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).

The State has made progress in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that (please check all that apply):

- ☒ Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs
- ☒ Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability
- ☒ Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency
- ☒ Provides quality rating and licensing information to parents with children enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs (e.g., displaying quality rating information at the program site)
- ☒ Makes program quality rating data, information, and licensing history (including any health and safety violations) publicly available in formats that are easy to understand and use for decision making by families selecting Early Learning and Development Programs and families whose children are enrolled in such programs.

Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs by the end of the grant period.

Although New Jersey has not conducted any ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids in the two years of implementing RTT-ELC, the Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Education and William Paterson University was established in the spring of 2015. In July 2015, the rating system was unveiled.

Since the establishment of the MOU, university staff has been attending reliability trainings on the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS) and CLASS. In addition, rating readiness documents were created to support programs in thoroughly identifying their level for ratings. Specific documents/pathways were created for NAEYC accredited programs and Head Start Programs. These documents are posted on www.grownjkids.com. Furthermore, the points system is also outlined and found on the website.

Based on feedback from the field, the original threshold scores for the ERS were amended. In addition, since the changes in the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scal-3 (ECERS-3) identify teacher-child interactions more specifically than previous versions of the tool, the participating state agencies decided that CLASS will not be used in the preschool classrooms. This move allowed for cost savings associated with instrumentation and training as well. This will be revisited again in 2017.

Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices? (If yes, please check all that apply.)

- ☒ Program and provider training
- ☒ Program and provider technical assistance
- ☒ Financial rewards or incentives
- ☐ Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates
- ☐ Increased compensation

Describe the progress made in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Grow NJ Kids and the multi-agency team that is led by the Department of Human Services is working on tracking trends and monitoring how programs are progressing through the system of supports that accompanies Grow NJ Kids participation. In addition, we offer a tiered incentives package that covers the various needs programs may have as they implement Grow NJ Kids, such as health and safety needs or needs associated with curricular implementation.

Lastly, the state has developed a multi-layered technical assistance approach. Programs are assigned a Quality Improvement Specialist (QIS) once they have completed the online orientation. The QIS assists the program in orienting the staff to Grow NJ Kids, enrolling the staff in the workforce registry, completing initial health and safety incentive requests based on needs identified by licensing, gathering program data, and targeting coaching on the environmental rating scale self-assessment. Once a program has completed a self-assessment, programs may then transition to one of the four regional technical assistance centers. Once the transition occurs, programs with the support of their technical assistance specialist unpack the Grow NJ Kids standards more deeply and identify areas that need further support.

This technical assistance approach will help ensure that measurable progress is made by the end of the grant period. The technical assistance centers will track performance outcomes such as, increased environmental rating scale scores and fidelity to curricular implementation.

Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(1)

In the table below, provide data on the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	56	473	912	1,351	1,790
Number of programs in Tier 1	14	118	221	279	332
Number of programs in Tier 2	14	118	221	279	335
Number of programs in Tier 3	22	189	376	635	899
Number of programs in Tier 4	3	24	47	79	113
Number of programs in Tier 5	3	24	47	79	111
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	56	428	633		
Number of programs in Tier 1	14	376	486		
Number of programs in Tier 2	14	52	147		
Number of programs in Tier 3	22	0	0		
Number of programs in Tier 4	3	0	0		
Number of programs in Tier 5	3	0	0		
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Data Notes

Describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

The baseline numbers were estimated with the idea that programs would have gone through the rating process. While New Jersey has not conducted any ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids in the first 2 years of RTT-ELC, William Paterson University, our rating partner has worked this past year in the development of the system. Requirements and a point system were developed. Rating Readiness was developed for general programs, NAEYC programs, and Head Start Programs. The process was unveiled in July and programs have been working towards Rating Readiness. All programs and family child care providers have a license or registration. All currently active pilot programs have submitted their self-assessment and quality improvement plan. First year programs are currently working on submitting their self-assessments, quality improvement plans, and incentive requests. In addition, this past year has been spent in developing tracking system for the various phases of GNJK.

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Target Notes**

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

Programs in the pilot have been working on implementing their quality improvement plans. Many are preparing to complete the rating readiness document. The directors' orientation was moved on line and the processes for enrolling have been improved.

The Incentives Coordinator has developed policies and procedures for applying for scholarships, classroom enhancement grants, substitute, and training reimbursement.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Definition of Highest Tiers

For purposes of Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2), how is the State defining its "highest tiers"?

The highest tiers are defined as:

3 star programs must have an average ECERS-3 score of 3.75, average ITERS-R score of a 5, staff must have attended at 5 hours of research-based curriculum training and meeting 30-59 points (each standard is assigned a point value).

4 star programs must have an average ECERS-3 score of 4.5, average ITERS-R score of a 5, Infant/Toddler CLASS score (Emotional Support and Classroom Organization) of a 5, staff must have attended 10 hours of training in the selected research-based curriculum and meeting 60-85 points.

5 star programs must have an average ECERS-3 score of a 5, average ITERS-R score of 6, Infant/Toddler CLASS score (Emotional Support and Classroom Organization) 5.5 and Infant/Toddler CLASS score (Instructional Support and Engaged Support for Learning, fully-implementing selected research-based curriculum, and meeting 86-100 points.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)

In the table below, provide data on the number and percentage of children with high needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	660	1.4%	6,240	13.5%	12,060	26.1%	19,800	42.9%	26,940	58.3%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	240	1.9%	1,440	11.6%	2,496	20.1%	3,744	30.1%	5,376	43.2%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	352	3.8%	1,152	12.5%	1,696	18.4%	1,856	20.2%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	38	0.2%	286	1.3%	495	2.2%	999	4.5%	1,620	7.3%
Other 1	0	0%	1,260	14.6%	2,460	28.4%	4,380	50.6%	4,620	53.4%
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs									
Other 2										
Describe:										
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows

Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

In most States, the **Number of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State** for the current reporting year will correspond to the **Total** reported in Table (A)(1)-3a. If not, please explain the reason in the data notes.

Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS															
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	46,177	660	1.4%	46,177	0	0%	46,177	0	0%						
<i>Specify:</i>	State-Funded Preschool Programs														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	12,447	240	1.9%	0	0	0%	12,447	0	0%						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	9,209	0	0%	0	0	0%	9,209	0	0%						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	22,186	38	0.2%	0	0	0%	22,186	0	0%						
Other 1	8,656	0	0%	0	0	0%	8,656	0	0%						
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows

Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Data Notes

Please indicate whether baseline data are actual or estimated; and describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

All early learning programs funded by Title 1 of ESEA are included within the State Preschool Program. Star levels 3, 4, and 5 are included as “top tiers”. As such, NJ has not identified programs in “top tiers” as ratings have not yet been conducted. Although New Jersey has not conducted any ratings of program using Grow NJ Kids in the first 2 years of implementing RTT-ELC, William Paterson University has spent much of the second year working on the process and educating providers on the process and requirements.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

We anticipate the rating process commencing in early 2016 and continuing throughout the life of the grant. New Jersey will continue to work toward meeting all grant targets by the end of the grant period. Given the differentiated strategies that are in place in each of the participating state agencies, we are confident that the proposed targets will be met by the end of the grant period.

Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).

Describe progress made during the reporting year in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

The study design includes child assessments (pre-post) with 1,800 prek children in years two (2015-16) and three (2016-17). Demographic surveys will be administered to all participating families, and surveys will also be administered to each center director/principal. In addition, 300 classrooms will be observed in years two and three.

These 300 classrooms will include a group that is part of the QRIS (for varying amounts of time) and a group that is not interested in becoming part of the QRIS.

Child assessments will be administered in the fall and spring of years two and three. Child assessments include one measure of language, one measure of early math, and two measures of executive function, as described below.

Descriptions of each child assessment measure are provided next:

Language: The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Fourth Edition (PPVT - IV) and Test de Vocabulario en Imagenes Peabody (TVIP). The PPVT -IV (Dunn & Dunn, 2007) is a test of receptive vocabulary in standard English. The TVIP (Dunn, Lugo, Padilla, & Dunn, 1986) uses 125 translated items from the half and test/retest

reliability as well as concurrent and predictive validity. NIEER has used both versions of the instrument in studies nationwide and have found that they are useful in discriminating growth across a broad range of children.

- *Math: The Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-Third Edition (WJ-III) and the Bateria Psico- Educativa Revisada de Woodcock-Muñoz (WM-R).* The WJ-III and WM-R (Woodcock & Johnson, 1989; Woodcock & Munoz-Sandoval, 1996) are comprehensive sets of individually administered tests of cognitive abilities and achievement.
- *Peg Tapping Task (PT; Diamond & Taylor, 1996).* In this assessment, children are asked to tap a peg twice when the experimenter taps once and vice versa. The task requires children to inhibit a natural tendency to mimic the experimenter while remembering the rule for the correct response.
- *Dimensional Change Card Sort (DCCS; Zelazo, 2006).* In this reverse categorization task, children must sort a set of cards based on different sorting criteria given by the examiner, thus assessing their attention- shifting.

In addition to child assessments, classroom quality measures will be employed to look at classroom-level experiences for children, and whether different levels of quality are represented and if so, whether they result in greater child growth. Classroom observations will be conducted in December through March of years 2 and 3. Each classroom will be observed twice.

The following classroom quality measures will be used:

- The *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008)* is an observational system that assesses classroom practices in preschool by measuring the interactions between students and adults. Observations consist of 4 to 5, 20minute cycles, followed by 10-minute coding periods. Scores are assigned during various classroom activities, and then averaged across all cycles.
- The *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale - Third Ed. (ECERS-3; Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2015)* is an observation and rating instrument for preschool classrooms serving children aged three to five. The total ECERS-R score represents an average of the scores on the 37 items. A rating of 1 indicates inadequate quality, 3 indicates minimal quality, 5 indicates good quality, and 7 indicates excellent quality.

This approach will assist in answering the study questions below:

1. Does obtaining a higher quality level result in greater child growth and school readiness and do these results apply to all subgroups of children?
2. Are the quality indicators being used in Grow NJ Kids, efficient and non-duplicative? Do they accurately reflect differential levels of program quality?
3. Is the technical assistance provided effective in improving quality and moving sites to higher levels?
4. What is the impact of incentives?
5. What are family perspectives on the process and are the ratings influencing their decision making?
6. Are providers satisfied with the supports that they are receiving?

DATA COLLECTION STATUS:

- 1,348 child assessments were completed in the fall
- All data is entered in SPSS
- 390 (out of 1,348) family surveys have been received.
- Classroom observation training and reliability has been completed. We have two teams of data collectors (1 for ECERS-3; 1 for CLASS) in the field.
- 40 ECERS-3 and 38 CLASS observations have been completed.
- There has been very little push back from programs during this phase of data collection - much different from the fall, as expected.

An administrator survey is given to each director/principal at each participating program (n=86),

A final report is anticipated in October 2017.

Focused Investment Areas -- Sections (C), (D), and (E)

Select the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan:

- ☒ (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- ☐ (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.
- ☒ (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.
- ☒ (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.
- ☒ (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- ☐ (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- ☒ (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- ☒ (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

Grantee should complete only those sections that correspond with the focused investment areas outlined in the grantee's RTT-ELC application and State Plan.

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Early Learning and Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards (check all that apply):

- ☒ Are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each defined age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers;
- ☒ Cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- ☒ Are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards; and
- ☒ Are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities.

Describe the progress made in the reporting year, including supports that are in place to promote the understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

The Birth to Three Early Learning Standards are aligned with the NJ Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards. An alignment document of these two documents is in final draft status with a few organizational edits being made. The BTT-ELS are also included in the state's QRIS tool, Grow NJ Kids.

Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to (check all that apply):

- ☐ Select assessment instruments and approaches that are appropriate for the target populations and purposes;
- ☐ Strengthen Early Childhood Educators' understanding of the purposes and uses of each type of assessment included in the Comprehensive Assessment Systems;
- ☐ Articulate an approach for aligning and integrating assessments and sharing assessment results; and
- ☐ Train Early Childhood Educators to appropriately administer assessments and interpret and use assessment data in order to inform and improve instruction, programs, and services.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

NEW JERSEY DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA C(2) IN ITS RTT ELC APPLICATION

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- ☒ Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety;
- ☒ Ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and
- ☒ Promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of your TQRIS Program Standards;
- ☒ Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported in meeting the health standards;
- ☒ Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and
- ☒ Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

New Jersey promotes health standards across all five levels of the Tiered QRIS (Grow NJ Kids Category 1: Safe, Healthy Learning Environments) that are adapted from Stepping Stones: Caring for Our Children. Grow NJ Kids is aligned with nationally accepted practices that promote high quality learning within a safe and healthy environment. Participating sites must meet standards for the physical environment, i.e., furnishings and classroom conditions; and offer age-appropriate activities/services that promote healthy eating, physical activity and oral health, based on the developmental abilities and capacities of the children. Grow NJ Kids establishes a common set of health standards for developmental, behavioral, and sensory screening, referral, and follow up; and health literacy is also addressed the levels and categories.

Central Intake: In Year 2, the NJ Department of Health expanded a core health component, Central Intake (CI), to improve access for parents and families to needed infant/child health services and supports in six previously unserved counties. These county-level CI Hubs function as a single point of entry to simplify the referral and linkage process to community-based services. Now operating in all 21 counties, CI helps to build stronger connections and communication, and support health literacy between parents, health care providers, and early learning programs.

Developmental Screening: NJ has several sectors that require routine developmental screening using a standardized tool. Sectors include evidence-based Home Visiting, Head Start/Early Head Start, state-funded Preschools, and now, participating Grow NJ Kids child care centers. Others voluntarily screen infants and young children, e.g. some of our health and child care providers. The screens are completed, but the information is not accessible to the child's pediatric primary care provider (medical home), or other sectors to avoid duplication. In July 2015, the NJ Department of Children and Families initiated a study to determine feasibility/viability/cost of using a data system (e.g. the NJ Immunization Registry or alternate mechanism) to track developmental screenings. The final report and recommendations will be available in March 2016.

Infant/Early Childhood Mental Health (IECMH): In the latter part of Year 2 (October-December 2015), DCF collaborated with Montclair State University to offer *Keeping Babies and Children in Mind*. This IECMH training was extremely well received by cross-sector early childhood partners, reaching 251 new participants.

BLANK PAGE DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

In the table, provide data on leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable statewide targets. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.

Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Number of Children with High Needs screened	75,399	75,399	79,169	83,128	87,284
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	7,104	7,104	7,459	7,832	8,224
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	73,648	73,648	77,330	81,197	85,257
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	72,239	72,239	75,851	79,644	83,626

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.

Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Number of Children with High Needs screened	75,399	86,880	95,480		
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	7,104	9,991	10,990		
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	73,648	85,142	93,642		
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	72,239	82,536	90,736		

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Data Notes

Please indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

Data in Table (C)(3)(d) is estimated based on enrollment. Baseline data inadvertently omitted infants and toddlers. The increase in Year 1 Actuals reflects the addition of these target populations. Enrollment in NJ State Pre-K, Early Head Start/Head Start, CCDF child care, and evidence-based Home Visiting programs require children to meet basic health standards, as reflected above.

Furthermore, in several early learning programs - NJ Home Visiting, Head Start/Early Head Start, and state-funded preschool programs - NJ has a strong alignment of health service components with the Medicaid/NJ FamilyCare (CHIP) Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment requirements; and, as appropriate, with the Child Find provisions for identifying children with potential disabilities. In fact, NJ licensing standards for early learning programs require children to have a medical exam upon entry that includes immunizations, and lead testing; thus providing a basis for the Medicaid/NJ FamilyCare (CHIP) Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) program requirements.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

In 2015, New Jersey met all of its targets by aiming to quantify and expand the numbers of children who:

- (1) Receive developmental screening (using the ASQ and ASQ: SE screening tool)
- (2) Are referred for services based on screening results, and, where appropriate, receive follow-up
- (3) Will receive ongoing health care
- (4) Are up to date in a schedule of well-child care visits, immunizations, developmental screening, etc.

Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- ☒ Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of your Program Standards;
- ☒ Including information on activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;
- ☒ Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported to implement the family engagement strategies; and
- ☒ Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

The Parent Standards are in draft form, at the time of this report. These standards have taken more time to complete as they were provided to various parenting groups to feedback. As the document has just made it to draft form, specific conversations as to what existing program/department will ensure its implementation is still in conversation. However, this conversation is occurring across 4 state departments.

The County Councils for Young Children (CCYC) is a statewide network of local councils with representation of parents/families, community residents and local community agencies/stakeholders that work together to support families as leaders as they map out the course of their child's success. The CCYCs are now operating in all 21 counties of New Jersey. The CCYCs have a direct link to the New Jersey Council for Young Children through the Family and Community Engagement Committee. Elected members of the CCYCs have participated in several Family and Community Engagement Committee meetings and provided guidance and input on the development on the Family Engagement Standards.

All 21 CCYCs have a designated coordinator and basic structure in place --Steering Committee, Health, Education and Safety Workgroups, and General Membership meetings. Committees/workgroups are co-led by community and parent stakeholders.

At the local level, CCYCs have been creative in partnering with parents/families to develop activities that better engage families and support children's education. For example, most of the CCYCs partner with their local library to coordinate story time for the children and workshops for parents. While the children are being read to, parents attend workshops and learn about the services of the local library, receive information on becoming library members, and receive library cards for themselves and their children. They learn how to use the local library for all its worth to assist families to succeed in their community.

Some CCYCs attended local "Back to School Nights" in the beginning of the school year. They met and recruited parents to attend the CCYC. They learned of the parents' expectations and goals for their children for the coming school year. They also encouraged parents to develop relationships with their child's teacher and stay involved at their child's school.

In March and June 2015, the Department of Children and Families (DCF), Rutgers School of Social Work-Institute for Families and Early Childhood partners conducted Strengthening Families (SF) training, *Bringing the Protective Factors Framework to Life*, to an estimated total of 500 participants. This training, developed by the National Alliance of Children's Trust and Prevention Funds, targeted parents and professionals (child welfare, early care and education, home visitors, child care resource and referral, family resource centers, parent advocacy, family support organizations, and others) to build local supports for families with children from pregnancy to age 8.

BLANK PAGE DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

(Section D(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in developing (check all that apply):

- ☒ A common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes; and
- ☒ A common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

The Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, otherwise known in NJ as the Core Knowledge and Competencies (CKC) document has been revised to include the latest research on ECE workforce. The CKC is also aligned to various state acknowledged standards, e.g., Birth to Three Early Learning Standards, Preschool Teaching & Learning Standards, Grow NJ Kids, NAEYC Standards, etc. The document also includes NJ's credential s and degrees lattice. A dissemination plan has been created to identify the implementation activities around this document to the ECE Field.

Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
(Section D(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes (check all that apply):

- ☐ Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;
- ☐ Implementing policies and incentives that promote professional and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention, including
 - ☐ Scholarships
 - ☐ Compensation and wage supplements,
 - ☐ Tiered reimbursement rates,
 - ☐ Other financial incentives
 - ☐ Management opportunities
- ☐ Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention
- ☐ Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for --
 - Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and
 - Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

NEW JERSDY DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA D(2) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION.
PAGES 41 OF 95 THROUGH 44 OF 95 HAVE BEEN DELETED

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that (check all that apply):

- ☒ Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- ☒ Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;
- ☒ Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the fourth year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten. States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;
- ☒ Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and
- ☒ Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Describe the domain coverage of the State's Kindergarten Entry Assessment, validity and reliability efforts regarding the Kindergarten Entry Assessment, and timing of the administration of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

Beginning in June of 2015, a total of seven hundred and three teachers and two hundred and thirty three district level administrators across forty-nine districts, were trained in Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD), a rigorous and appropriate performance-based assessment instrument. During the first seven weeks of kindergarten, teachers collected evidence of children's performance across three of the nine Teaching Strategies Gold domains including, social emotional, literacy, and mathematics, for the purpose of assigning a score along a developmental continuum. Teachers who are in year two of implementation collected evidence on two additional Teaching Strategies Gold domains including, cognitive and language. Once teachers made ratings for each child at the end of the seven-week period, teachers, administrators, and DOE representatives were able to view scores of individual children as well as aggregate scores across all districts within each learning domain. As a way to inform instruction and monitor goal setting through the year, all teachers are continuing to use GOLD throughout the entire school year.

One Technical Assistance Visit was made by Teaching Strategies within the first seven weeks, as well as subsequent visits at individual district requests. As a strategy to support best practices in the kindergarten year, teachers participating in NJKEA also attended the Kindergarten Seminars, which is a five day regional series that began in October of 2015 and ends in April of 2016. This exciting and novel approach to support NJKEA implementation proved fruitful in that year two of implementation has revolved around best practices (e.g., curricular, whole-child learning, and appropriate environments) rather than merely another assessment initiative.

The seminars provide participants with an introduction to key features of New Jersey's Kindergarten Implementation Guidelines and the NJKEA initiative. The series includes sessions to support teachers in organizing classroom environments and schedules, implementing developmentally appropriate practices, applying effective teaching strategies that support children's development and learning, incorporating the common core standards and weaving in the GOLD assessment cycle throughout. Finally, all participants will use the instrument throughout the kindergarten year as a formative assessment tool.

While it is true that teachers often complete many assessments within districts, it is rare that teachers complete

assessments that include the full range of developmental learning domains that recognize the complexity of young children, such as *Social & Emotional Development, Cognition, and Approaches to Learning* domains.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

As mentioned above, a total of seven hundred and three teachers and two hundred and thirty three district level administrators across forty-nine districts, were trained in Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD), a rigorous and appropriate performance-based assessment instrument. Throughout the year, we have been soliciting participation for subsequent years. In early spring we will make presentations at superintendent round table meetings throughout the state to finalize participation for the following year as well as communicate the timing for professional development offerings. We intend on continuing this process throughout the life of the grant.

Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that (check all that apply):

- ☒ Has all of the Essential Data Elements;
- ☒ Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;
- ☒ Facilitates the exchange of data among Participating State Agencies by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions such as Common Education Data Standards to ensure interoperability among the various levels and types of data;
- ☒ Generates information that is timely, relevant, accessible, and easy for Early Learning and Development Programs and Early Childhood Educators to use for continuous improvement and decision making; and
- ☒ Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including the State's progress in building or enhancing a separate early learning data system that aligns with and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that meets the criteria described above. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

2015 has been a very busy year for Project 8: Data Systems, NJ-EASEL. Several Project Milestones and Deliverables have been met or are in progress including the following:

- Project Management: Completed Project Planning (together with the completion of a Work Breakdown Structure which is continually monitored and updated), a Project Charter, Project Management Plan, and implementation of the NJ-EASEL SharePoint where all project documentation is stored and available to the NJ-EASEL project team.
- Data Governance: Data Governance Plan (DGP) completed and executed by 3 of the 4 NJ-EASEL participating agencies. The DGP includes the Data Governance Model of the NJ-EASEL project teams, their roles and responsibilities; Data Sharing Agreements (DSA) between the agencies are in progress with one fully executed DSA between NJ DOE as the lead agency and NJ's Office of Information Technology (OIT).
- Requirements Definition & Analysis: Completed Joint Application Development (JAD) Requirements Sessions for Reporting to capture user priorities, as well as JADs with each of the 4 agencies resulting in a Crosswalk Analysis document reflecting the systems and corresponding data elements for each of the Key Questions and Objectives, Source Data Analysis Sessions are in progress providing a more in depth understanding and clarification of the required data elements for data mapping and analysis.
- Design: Completed NJ-EASEL Conceptual Systems Design, as well as Logical and Physical Data Model Designs for all NJ DOE systems. Initiated Logical Data Model Designs for NJ DCF, NJ DHS and NJ DOH systems.
- Development & Testing: Completed development of Source System Interfaces for Phase 1 systems.

The NJ-EASEL implementation plan by the end of the grant period is scheduled to include standard reports based on Phase 1 and Phase 2 systems, which are a subset of the overall 14 systems.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development.

In the tables that follow, provide updated data on the State's commitment to early learning and development as demonstrated in Section A(1) of the State's RTT-ELC application. Tables A(1) -1 through 3 should be updated with current data. Tables 4 and 5 should provide data for the reporting year as well as previous years of the grant. Tables 6 and 7 may be updated only where significant changes have occurred (if no changes have occurred, you should note that fact).

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income¹ families, by age

	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	38,437	6.4%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	76,780	12.7%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	76,481	14%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	191,678	32%

¹ Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.

Data Table A(1)-1 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, "Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Single Year of Age and Sex for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico Commonwealth: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013"; and National KIDS COUNT Program "Children Ages 0 to 8 below 200 Percent Poverty 2014".

Census data projections for 2013 were used along with the percent of children Ages 0 to 8 whose families were below 200% of poverty in New Jersey in 2014 (32%) to estimate the number of children from low-income families in the state in these specific age ranges.

Table (A)(1)-2: Special populations of Children with High Needs

The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs.

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	33,728	5.6%
Are English learners ²	180,638	30%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0%
Are migrant ³	361	0.06%
Are homeless ⁴	4,818	0.8%
Are in foster care	3,495	0.6%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

¹For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

²For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.

³For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).

⁴The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).

Data Table A(1)-2 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

For disabilities or developmental delays: Number is estimated for children birth to kindergarten entry based on the percentage of students with disabilities in state-funded preschool programs.

For ELL: Number is estimated for children birth to kindergarten entry based on the percent of children ages five and older speaking a language other than English in the home (US Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2009-2013).

For Migrant: Number is estimated based on percent of migrant children, preschool-grade 12, captured in the state's longitudinal data system during the 14-15 school year.

For Homeless: Number is estimated based on percent of homeless children, preschool-grade 12, captured in the state's CPSR during the 14-15 school year.

For Foster Care: Point in time data collection in June 2014 from the Department of Children and Families' NJ SPIRIT data system used to determine approximate percentage of population.

Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age

Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool	0	0	43,891	43,891
<i>Specify:</i>	State Preschool Program			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2015 ASSA			
Early Head Start and Head Start¹	555	2,087	13,707	16,349
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Office of Head Start-Program Information Report (PIR) Enrollment Statistics Report-2			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	729	10,684	11,943	23,356
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Count: 12/1/2014 (IDEA-Part C), 10/15/2014 IDEA (Part B)			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	135	13,773	13,908
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2013-14 CSPR (Section 2.1.2.3) Stand alone PK's are not eligible to be Title I served			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	2,231	12,587	12,216	27,304
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Care Viewer Report, October 2012.			
Other 1	0	0	8,129	8,129
<i>Specify:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2013-14 Projected Enrollment from individual state-approved budgets for each district			
Other 2	2,777	2,373	278	5,428
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting (excludes pregnant women)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 3				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 4				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 5				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 6				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

Table (A)(1)-3a - Additional Other rows

	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
Other 7				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 8				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.				

Data Table A(1)-3a Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	22,572	84	1,580	14,113	105	300	5,136
Specify:	State Preschool Program						
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	8,189	62	415	5,833	19	1,029	4,052
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	3,245	11	674	1,116	19	443	5,301
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	14	933	1,613	46	228	5,674
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4,624	17	392	3,376	31	73	2,267
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	10,292	13	264	9,534	58	179	4,601
Other 1	2,667	13	596	1,484	22	142	3,104
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs						
Other 2	2,196	15	46	1,459	69	154	879
Describe:	Home Visiting (excludes pregnant women)						
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							

Table (A)(1)-3b - Additional Other rows

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
Other 3	3,009	0	97	3,105		97	6,212
<i>Describe:</i>	Special Child Health Services Case Management						
Other 4							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 5							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 6							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 7							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 8							
<i>Describe:</i>							

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

The total number of children in Head Start centers above adds up to more than the children listed on Tables 3 and 5 due to classification of children in multiple categories.

Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.

Note: For States that have a biennial State budget, please complete for all fiscal years for which State funds have been appropriated. We are not asking for forecasting, but for actual allocations. Therefore, States that do not have biennial budgets need not complete for years for which appropriations do not yet exist.

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start¹	\$39,800,000	\$40,300,000	\$40,400,000		
State-funded preschool	\$591,800,000	\$603,700,000	\$608,200,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	State Preschool Program				
State contributions to IDEA Part C	\$85,900,000	\$85,900,000	\$91,100,000		
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$56,900,000	\$59,800,000	\$59,800,000		
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$72,100,000	\$72,200,000	\$72,200,000		
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met		
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$54,200,000	\$76,000,000	\$76,000,000		
Other State contributions 1	\$41,900,000	\$44,000,000	\$45,800,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other State contributions 2	\$20,600,000	\$20,600,000	\$20,600,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	Evidence-Based Home Visiting (HV)				
Other State contributions 3	\$650,000	\$650,000	\$650,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	Strengthening Families / PF Framework				
Other State contributions 4	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$30,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	Help Me Grow				
Other State contributions 5	0	\$140,000	\$140,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	ECCS Grant				
Other State contributions 6	0	\$800,000	\$800,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	Project Launch				

Table (A)(1)-4 - Additional Other rows

Funding for each Fiscal Year

Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Other State contributions 7					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 8					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Total State contributions:	\$1,010,000,000	\$1,050,000,000	\$1,060,320,000		

¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

² Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

³ Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data, including the State's fiscal year end date.

Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs. However, the current year should match the program totals reported in Table (A)(1)-3a.

Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program ¹					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
State-funded preschool (annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)	43,671	43,891	43,891		
Specify:	State Funded Preschool				
Early Head Start and Head Start ² (funded enrollment)	15,944	15,464	16,349		
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (annual December 1 count)	12,031	22,840	23,356		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA (total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)	10,780	10,780	13,908		
Programs receiving CCDF funds (average monthly served)	23,849	25,211	27,034		
Other 1	8,189	8,028	8,129		
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other 2	5,316	6,194	7,061		
Describe:	Special Child Health Services Birth Registry				
Other 3	4,878	5,428	7,104		
Describe:	Home Visiting - statewide network of multiple models - pregnancy to age 3				
Other 4	1,799	2,818	3,832		
Describe:	Special Child Health Services Autism Registry				
Other 5	10,454	11,241	12,027		
Describe:	Special Child Health Services (Medically Fragile Children)				
Other 6					
Describe:					
Other 7					
Describe:					
Other 8					
Describe:					

¹ Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.
² Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed. Include current year if data are available.

*2015 data is not yet available. As estimated is provided based on the average increase over the prior three years.

**Over 99% of the children supported through Title I funds are served in districts within the DOE's three preschool programs. 2015 figures are not yet available. The number of children 0-5 served through Title I has historically varied from year to year. However, we estimate at least a stable number of children from 2014 to 2015 as we believe many of these districts are currently using Title I funding to support summer programs for preschool-aged children.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development	X	X	X
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	X	X	X
Approaches toward learning	X	X	X
Physical well-being and motor development	X	X	X
Social and emotional development	X	X	X

Data Table A(1)-6 Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Specify:</i>	State Preschool Program				
Early Head Start and Head Start¹					
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C		X			X
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X			
Programs receiving CCDF funds					
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	X		X		X
Tier 1					
Tier 2	X	X	X	X	X
Tier 3	X	X	X	X	X
Tier 4	X	X	X	X	X
Tier 5	X	X	X	X	X
State licensing requirements	X		X		X
Other 1	X	X	X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other 2	X	X	X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Evidence-Based Home Visiting (HV)				
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

Table (A)(1)-7 - Additional Other rows					
Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes
 Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data if needed.

Budget and Expenditures

Budget Summary Table Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

After a slow start in Year 1, New Jersey's RTT-ELC budget spending increased significantly in Year 2. However, despite noteworthy progress across our grant projects, we still under expended overall. Our primary areas of under spent funding were within our Grow NJ Kids incentives project (Project 3) and our NJ-EASEL initiative (Project 8). We are in the process of reevaluating our incentive offerings for the remainder of the grant period, and propose to repurpose a portion of the funding for other grant work. While our NJ-EASEL initiative made great strides during Year 2, our payment vehicle has not yet been formalized, resulting in delayed payments. We hope to rectify this issue during Year 3.

It is also important to note that our in-kind contribution for NJ's Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) was substantially less than anticipated during Year 2. We experienced difficulties with our KEA vendor, resulting in lower costs to the state and, therefore, a lower in-kind contribution.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Delays in Grow NJ Kids trainings and participant registration have had a ripple effect on several of our grant projects. Our plan, and therefore our budget, for Grow NJ Kids trainings is resulting in the most substantial changes to our RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year. Starting in Year 3, Grow NJ Kids trainings will be coordinated through DHS. As a result, a significant portion of our unspent incentive funding needs to be repurposed to support DHS in this work. Funding initially set aside for the training (though a DOE MOU) will be transferred for grant-related work in other projects, overseen by DOE and DCF. As a result of the above delays, our work with Grow NJ Kids Ratings and Validation is also delayed, requiring us to carry grant funding forward to future years. However, despite these delays, we are confident that the momentum we built during Year 2 of the grant will continue to build, and allow us to achieve even more significant milestones during the final 2 years of the grant period.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: Grant Administration

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

All grant staff were fully employed during the entire 2015 grant year, but total salary and benefit costs were slightly overestimated. The travel, equipment and supply lines also have minor balances for Year 2, which will be carried forward for future grant work. The largest discrepancy between our approved budget and total expenditures for Year 2 is in our Indirect Cost line. Charges to this line have been coming a few weeks after expenditures are made, so we expect a portion of our Indirect associated with Year 2 costs to be charged during Year 3.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The only substantive change we anticipate involves hiring a business analyst for our NJ-EASEL data systems project. We are currently contracting for business analyst services in Project 8 on a part-time basis, but anticipate bringing our contractor on as a full-time employee. This will allow her to work additional hours needed to support our project manager, and help make further progress on the project. After researching the impact of this change, we have determined that hiring our business analyst will actually cost less than maintaining her as a contractor, even with added hours. Although the NJ-EASEL project got a late start, we made remarkable progress during Year 2 and hope to continue that level of progress during Years 3 and 4. We believe that this change will help us to accomplish this goal. In order to do this, and also maintain salary and benefit coverage for existing grant-funded staff, we are proposing to transfer a total of \$800,000 from Project 2 to Project 1. Below is a brief summary of our proposed transfer.

Summary of Transfers into Project 1			
	Year 3	Year 4	Totals
Salary	\$334,000.00	\$334,000.00	\$668,000.00
Fringe	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00
Indirect		\$32,000.00	\$32,000.00
	\$384,000.00	\$416,000.00	\$800,000.00

Project Budget 2

Project Name: Aligned Training and Professional Development

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Total costs for Project 2 were over projected by \$759,993.93 in Year 2. All Indirect Cost funding (\$3,764) was unspent, though we do anticipate that some of these expenses will be charged during Year 3. The vast majority of under spent funding in Year 3 (\$756,229.93) can be attributed to our recently dissolved Training Academy MOU. While productive work was completed during Year 2 (and grant funding spent accordingly), we felt that this particular arrangement was not working the way we initially envisioned, and we chose to end our Training Academy MOU as of December 31, 2015. One final invoice was processed during the first month of Year 3 and indirect charges will follow.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Due to the change in our plan for implementing Grow NJ Kids trainings, we anticipate several substantive changes to our Year 3 and 4 budgets for Project 2. The primary reason for these changes is that DHS will be coordinating Grow NJ Kids trainings for the remainder of the grant period. While the budget for Project 2 is still substantial, very little of the funding in this project is currently designated to DHS. However, in Project 3, a substantial portion of funding is designated to DHS for Grow NJ Kids incentives. Instead of designating additional funding to DHS for coordination of Grow NJ Kids trainings in Project 2, we would like to repurpose a portion of our unspent incentives funding for this purpose, requiring a transfer of funding from Project 3 to Project 2. At the same time, we are proposing to transfer much of the funding currently in Project 2 (which is designated to DOE) into other projects where DOE and DCF can repurpose the funding to complete other projects. Below is a description of our proposed transfers out of Project 2, followed by a description of proposed transfers into Project 2.

Transfer of DOE-Designated Grant Funding out of Project 2

Overall, we would like to transfer a total of \$4,009,500 out of Project 2. We are proposing to transfer \$800,000 from Project 2 to Project 1. This includes \$759,993.93 in unspent Year 2 funding as well as an additional \$40,000.06 from Year 3 (for a total of \$800,000) and will be used to cover additional salary, fringe and indirect costs in Project 1 (see Project 1 narrative for additional details). Included in our Project 6 narrative are details of a pilot program for Home Visiting families. In order to accomplish this goal, we need to transfer a total of \$300,000 from Project 2 to Project 6, and we will include this amount in an amendment to DCF's current MOA and scope of work. Into Project 8, we aim to transfer \$1,500,000 of Year 4 Project 2 funding to cover additional anticipated costs to our NJ-EASEL initiative (see Project 8 for additional details). Finally, we are proposing to transfer a total of \$1,409,500 from Project 2 into Project 9. This transfer includes \$1,209,500 from Year 3 and \$200,000 from Year 4 of our current budget for Project 2 (see Project 9 narrative for additional details). The table below summarizes the overall transfers from Project 2.

Transfers out of Project 2

	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Project 1 (DOE)	\$756,229.93	\$43,770.07		\$800,000.00
Project 6 (DCF)		\$300,000.00	\$300,000.00	
Project 8 (DOE)		\$1,500,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	
Project 9 (DOE)		\$1,209,500.00	\$200,000.00	\$1,409,500.00
	\$756,229.93	\$1,253,270.07	\$2,000,000.00	\$4,009,500.00

Transfer of DHS-Designated Grant Funding Into Project 2

In order to successfully manage Grow NJ Kids trainings for the remainder of the grant period, DHS will need to have designated funding available within Project 2. As stated above, expenditures related to Grow NJ Kids incentives have been lower than expected, and we are proposing the repurpose a portion of that funding to Project 2 for DHS to oversee Grow NJ Kids trainings. This transfer will include \$4,746,800 from Line 11 in the Year 3 budget for Project 3 into Line 11 of Project 2. DHS will use this funding to hire Grow NJ Kids trainers and associated supplies.

Project Budget 3

Project Name: Grow NJ Kids Rollout and Incentives Administration

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Our Year 2 budget for Project 3 was under expended by approximately \$4 million. Of this total, \$54,665.92 in unspent funding is related to slight discrepancies in salary, fringe and indirect costs. We will carry forward to Year 3 all under spent funding in the Salary, Fringe and Indirect Cost lines. The vast majority of overall unspent funding (\$3,924,013.75) is associated with incentives for Grow NJ Kids participants. Lower than expected enrollment in Grow NJ Kids is the primary reason for this over projection. As we pass the halfway point in the grant, we are reevaluating the amount of funding we can reasonably spend on incentives, and propose to repurpose a significant amount of this funding for other projects. Further details can be found below.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

A significant amount of funding for Grow NJ Kids incentives was unspent during the first 2 years of the grant. As of December 31, 2015, we expended approximately \$494,808 of our total current budget of \$14,412,009.96 dedicated to Grow NJ Kids incentives. Given the halfway point in the grant period, we are proposing to repurpose a significant portion of this funding to other projects. In all, we aim to transfer a total of \$5,956,800 in unspent incentive funding to Projects 2 and 8, and to an existing MOU within Project 3.

For Project 2, we are proposing to transfer a total of \$4,746,800 in Year 3 funding from Line 11 of Project 3. A portion of this funding would be transferred to Year 3 of Line 11 in Project 2 for DHS to oversee all trainings related to Grow NJ Kids (\$4,000,000) and to Year 3 of the Contractual line for DHS to purchase curriculum training materials for Grow NJ Kids trainers and participants (\$700,000). The remaining \$46,800 would be split event across the contractual lines for Years 3 and 4 to fund the purchase of an assessment tool for Grow NJ Kids trainers.

Into Project 8, we are proposing to transfer a total of \$1,210,000. As described in the narrative for Project 8, DHS is seeking to adopt a new data system for Grow NJ Kids participants. Approximately \$1,200,000 is needed for this initiative. The remaining \$10,000 would be used to increase the current budget for Professional Impact New Jersey to oversee NJ's Workforce Registry. Costs for the Registry have increased more than anticipated as a result of Grow NJ Kids, as well as the demands of the NJ-EASEL data system.

After these transfers, our budget for Grow NJ Kids incentives will be reduced to \$8,455,209.96 (including \$494,808 in current expenditures and \$7,960,401.96 for future expenditures). Even after this transfer, our budget for Grow NJ Kids incentives in the final 2 years of the grant will be higher than our original budget for those 2 years. Through a redoubling of efforts in our communications campaign (Project 7), we hope to increase both participation in Grow NJ Kids, and the rate at which participants take advantage of the incentives being offered.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Independent Ratings for Program Quality Improvement

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Total costs for Project 4 were over projected by \$510,550 in Year 2. While Grow NJ Kids participation has increased during Year 2, fewer programs than expected were ready for a formal rating. The Grow NJ Kids Coordinator and RTT-ELC Executive Director are working with Grow NJ Kids participants to assess current barriers to ratings, and to determine the best ways in which to incentivize programs to engage in the ratings process. As of the end of Year 2, \$128,325.29 was expended for Project 4. This funding represents the work of William Paterson University (WPU) to develop the ratings process for Grow NJ Kids. WPU continues to refine the ratings process and train raters for the influx of programs we anticipate will need ratings during Years 3 and 4.



Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We are proposing to move \$510,550 in unspent contractual and indirect funding from Year 2 to future grant years. Unspent indirect cost funding in the amount of \$975 will be transferred into the Indirect Cost line item for Year 3. Indirect costs from our Year 2 payments to William Paterson University have not yet been charged against the grant, and we anticipate that these charges will come during Year 3. Unspent funding from the Contractual line in the amount of \$509,575 will be transferred into the Contractual lines for Years 3 and 4. We are proposing to move \$200,000 into Year 3 and \$309,74.71 into Year 4. While Grow NJ Kids ratings have been slow in Year 2, we are anticipating that they will increase during the final two years of the grant.

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Validating the Grow NJ Kids Tiered QRIS

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Year 2 costs for Project 5 were overestimated by \$431,982.55. This discrepancy is due to the fact that the validation study for Grow NJ Kids was delayed as a result of the smaller than anticipated number of programs prepared to receive a formal rating. The validation study is dependent upon having a statistically significant number of programs rated in Grow NJ Kids. As stated in the narrative for Project 4, we are in the process of incentivizing the ratings process for Grow NJ Kids participants, and we anticipate having many programs rated during Years 3 and 4 of the grant. In the meantime, through our MOU with Rutgers, the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) is already working to develop materials for the validation study, and the costs associated with that work are reflected in the expenditures made during Year 2.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We are proposing to move \$431,982.55 in unspent contractual and indirect funding from Year 2 to future grant years. Unspent indirect cost funding in the amount of \$975 will be transferred into the Indirect Cost line item for Year 3. Indirect costs from our Year 2 payments to NIEER have not yet been charged against the grant, and we anticipate that these charges will come during Year 3, along with indirect costs already budgeted during that year. Unspent funding from the Contractual line in the amount of \$431,007.55 will be transferred into the Contractual lines for Years 3 and 4. We are proposing to move \$200,000 into Year 3 and \$231,007.55 into Year 4. While the Grow NJ Kids validation study got off to a slower start than we initially expected, we anticipate that this work will be back on schedule during the final two years of the grant.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: Family Engagement and Health Promotion

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Approximately \$501,070.31 in Year 2 grant funding went unexpended for Project 6. Expenditures related to our County Councils for Young Children and Central In-take Hubs began slowly in Year 2, but as each made significant progress throughout the year, these expenditures increased. We are very confident that expenditures for this work will remain on track throughout the remainder of the grant period. Contractual funding in the amount of \$18,220 also went unspent due to an overestimation of the costs associated with training on Keeping Babies and Children in Mind during Year 2. We plan to carry this funding over to Year 3 to complete the training.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

All unspent contractual funding (\$18,220) will be carried over to Year 3 to continue training on Keeping Babies and Children in Mind. Unspent funding from Line 11 (\$482,850.31) will also be carried forward to Year 3, as we anticipate the costs for both the County Councils for Young Children, and the Central In-take Hubs to continue to build up to our initially budgeted amounts. The only other substantive change within Project 6 is a transfer of \$300,000 into the Contractual line for Year 3. This funding is being transferred out of the Year 4 Contractual line for Project 2. Funding in Project 2 was made available as a result of our ended MOU with Rutgers for the Training Academy (see Project 2 for further details). We are proposing to use the funding transferred into Project 6 for a pilot incentive program for Home Visiting families. Our goal is to provide meaningful one-time incentives to families to encourage longer-term participation in Home Visiting programs.

Project Budget 7

Project Name: Public Outreach and Awareness

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Total Year 2 expenditures for Project 7 were over projected by \$291,142.95. A small portion of this (\$3,257) is attributed to under spent Indirect Costs, though we expect some of these charges will be expensed during the first part of Year 3. The larger portion of unspent funding (\$287,885.95) is from the Contractual line, where expenses for advertizing, the development of a Grow NJ Kids website and newsletter, and work to develop business partnerships were lower than anticipated. Work in each of these areas is progressing, however, and we expect to see greater expenditures during Years 3 and 4.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We are proposing to move all unspent Year 2 Indirect Cost funding and Contractual funding into Year 3. As stated above, we expect that some indirect costs from Year 2 will be expensed in Year 3. Some Year 2 work from our newsletter and advertising campaign may also be charged against the grant in the early part Year 3, as invoices continue to arrive.

We expect to maintain our advertising campaign as planned with some added components to help increase participation in the Grow NJ Kids incentives program. Through surveys and anecdotes, our Grow NJ Kids team discovered that many of our QRIS participants were unclear about the incentives process and offerings. Our goal is to highlight several programs and individuals who have benefited from Grow NJ Kids incentives, and use their stories to encourage more participants to take advantage of the resources available during the grant period. We anticipate that this additional work in Years 3 and 4 will require some of the unspent funding carried over from Year 2.

Our plan to engage with New Jersey business leaders is well underway. Through an RFQ process, we recently cut a purchase order to work with the United Way to develop partnerships with the New Jersey business community. We expect to begin expending this funding within the first months of Year 3.

Project Budget 8

Project Name: Data Systems

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

In Year 2, Project 8 was under expended by \$1,246,355.23. The vast majority of this discrepancy (\$1,000,000) is due to a delay in the development of a contract/MOA with our state Office of Information Technology (OIT) to develop our NJ-EASEL data system. This lack of payment is not due to a lack of work on this project, however. OIT is working diligently to develop the NJ-EASEL system, and significant progress has been made, particularly over the last 12 months. OIT does not typically use a contract/MOA as a vehicle for receiving payments, but they would like to develop a document that can be used as a model in other similar situations. As a result, the contract/MOA template is undergoing extensive review and has not yet been executed. Once the document is signed, OIT will expense the NJ DOE for all of the work that has been done to this point in the grant period. We intend to carry forward the unexpended funding from Year 2 to Years 3 and 4 in anticipation of this.

Other discrepancies in the Year 2 budget can be attributed to our Equipment (\$18,807.23) and Contractual lines (\$227,548). As NJ-EASEL work continues to progress, we expect that more grant funding will be expended on equipment. Funding in the Contractual line is supporting an expansion of our Workforce Registry to accommodate Grow NJ Kids participants. Expenditures have been lower than expected due to slower than anticipated Grow NJ Kids registration, but we believe that expenditures will increase in Years 3 and 4 to meet our original budget projections.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Aside from the transfers described above, we are proposing to transfer additional funding into Project 8 for Years 3 and 4 of the grant period. We would like to transfer \$750,000 into both Year 3 and Year 4 in the "Other" line of Project 8 (for a total increase of \$1,500,000). We anticipate that our original budget for the NJ-EASEL project was significantly underestimated and that this funding will be critical to the success of the project during the final years of the grant. This funding comes from our Year 4 Contractual line in Project 2, which has decreased since ending our MOU for the Training Academy (see Project 2 narrative for further details).

We are also proposing to transfer \$1,210,000 into our Year 3 Contractual line in Project 8. This funding would support the purchase of a data system dedicated to Grow NJ Kids (\$1,200,000), as well as provide additional support to our Workforce Registry (\$10,000). As more programs enroll in Grow NJ Kids, we discovered that our Workforce Registry does not have the capacity to efficiently collect and store data for Grow NJ Kids participants. Instead, we are proposing to purchase a new system, built and specifically designed for QRIS programs. Our goal is to choose a system that will interface with the Licensing system also being purchased in Year 3. Additional funding for our Workforce Registry will support increasing records due to Grow NJ Kids, as well as the increasing demands of the NJ-EASEL data system.

Both of the new Grow NJ Kids system and the Workforce Registry are included in the NJ-EASEL project, so we will work to integrate other existing systems while these two are being developed. We envision that integration with NJ-EASEL will be much smoother once these new systems are operational. Funding for this transfer would come out of our Year 3 funds for Project 3. We have significantly under spent funding dedicated to incentives in Line 11 of this project and are proposing to repurpose a portion of that funding for other critical needs.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

Project Budget 9

Project Name: Preschool-Third Grade Initiatives

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The Year 3 budget for Project 9 was under spent by a total of \$410,539.82. Of this, \$250,000 is associated with our grants to four districts to explore technology-based curricula. The grants were awarded during Year 2, but no funding was charged until the start of Year 3. We expect the grantees to expend their full award amounts during Year 3.

Approximately \$158,589.82 also went unexpended in our Contractual line. Through an MOU, NIEER and the Graduate School of Education (GSE) at Rutgers have finished developing First through Third Grade Guidelines for New Jersey, and this work has already been charged to the grant. NIEER and the GSE are now in the process of developing a video to support the use of the Guidelines and are developing additional training assistance to support school districts. This work is now scheduled to be completed within the first quarter of Year 3. We expect these funds to be fully expended at that time, along with \$1,950 in associated indirect costs.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

As referenced above, we are proposing to carry forward all unexpended Year 2 funding from Project 9. A total of \$158,589.82 in unspent funding in the Contractual line will be expended during the first quarter of Year 3, along with \$1,950 from the Indirect Cost line. Our sub-grant to districts (budgeted in Line 11) will also be fully expended during Year 3, requiring a transfer of \$250,000 from Year 2 to Year 3.

In addition to the above transfers, we are proposing to transfer a total of \$1,409,500 from Project 2 into the Contractual line of Project 9. The majority of funding will come from Year 3 (\$1,209,500), with the remainder (\$200,000) coming from Year 4. This funding will be used to accomplish work in the three areas described below.

Approximately \$1,170,000 of the funding from this transfer will be used to conduct a study of classroom quality in Kindergarten through Third Grade classrooms. We intend to develop an MOU with NIEER and the GSE at Rutgers to conduct this study during the final two years of the grant (\$670,000 in Year 3 and \$500,000 in Year 4). Our goal is to be able to use this study to further inform training for districts on our Kindergarten and First through Third Grade Guidelines. New Jersey already conducts a similar bi-annual study of preschool classroom quality, which has helped to significantly increase overall program quality. Costs for this MOU were estimated based on past MOU's for the preschool quality study.

We are also proposing to use \$200,000 of this total transfer during Year 3 to develop an MOU with William Paterson University to update our existing Preschool Guidelines. The New Jersey Preschool Program Implementation Guidelines were originally developed in 2003. While they have been updated by the NJ DOE since that time, we see this is an opportunity to work with a university to conduct a more complete reassessment of the Guidelines. This reassessment would include an expert review, and the development of video vignettes to assist in training on the revised Guidelines.

The last \$39,500 of this transfer would be used during Year 3 to develop a self-assessment tool for Kindergarten through Grade Three programs. New Jersey's preschool programs currently use a state-developed self-assessment tool on an annual basis to identify gaps in quality and best practices. The self-assessment helps

districts to take corrective actions that lead to long-term program improvement. We plan to use a sealed-bid process to hire an outside expert to develop this companion self-assessment tool for the primary grades.

Project Budget 10

Project Name: Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

No grant funding was projected during Year 2 in Project 10. Our estimate of in-kind funding during Year 3 was overestimated by about \$184,329. A great deal of effort went into our Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) initiative during Year 2 of the grant. Trainings were conducted continuously throughout the state to support classroom teachers in the use of the KEA, and to strengthen Kindergarten practices. However, unforeseen issues with the online platform forced our KEA vendor to lower our annual charges, and thus our in-kind contribution in this area.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

We are not anticipating any substantive changes to our Year 3 budget for Project 10.

Project Budget 11

Project Name: Standards

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Our Year 2 budget for Project 11 was under spent by \$112,316. All work associated with this project involves the editing, formatting, printing and distribution of various Guidance and Standards documents. Slight delays in the development of these documents, as well as the decision to complete some of this work without grant funding, has resulted in unspent funding for this project.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

At this time, we are proposing to carry all unspent Year 2 funding into Year 3. Once all grant-related Guidance and Standards documents are ready for distribution, we will reevaluate the funding set aside within this project and consider possible budget transfers to other areas of need within our overall grant.

Project Budget 12

Project Name: _____

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

THE NEW JERSEY RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 11 PROJECTS.
PAGES 78-95 HAVE BEEN DELETED.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

RTT-ELC Budget Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$239,425.53	\$419,404.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$658,829.82
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,777.15	\$187,237.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$214,014.83
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$2,030.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,030.80
4. Equipment	\$4,333.73	\$17,997.24	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,330.97
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,053.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,053.82
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$3,059,782.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,059,782.79
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$17,893.94	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$17,893.94
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$270,536.41	\$3,705,400.56	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,975,936.97
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,514.05	\$10,973.14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,487.19
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$149,300.00	\$2,789,647.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,938,947.69
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$50,812.07	\$37,866.19	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$88,678.26
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$475,162.53	\$6,543,887.58	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,019,050.11
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$19,671,594.87	\$20,139,472.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$39,811,067.17
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$20,146,757.40	\$26,683,359.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$46,830,117.28

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Grant Administration

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$239,425.53	\$371,867.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$611,292.87
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,777.15	\$173,145.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$199,922.80
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$2,030.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,030.80
4. Equipment	\$4,333.73	\$7,370.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,704.41
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,053.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,053.82
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$17,893.94	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$17,893.94
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$270,536.41	\$573,362.23	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$843,898.64
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,514.05	\$10,973.14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,487.19
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$50,812.07	\$37,866.19	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$88,678.26
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$325,862.53	\$622,201.56	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$948,064.09
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$86,120.00	\$86,120.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$172,240.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$411,982.53	\$708,321.56	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,120,304.09

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - Aligned Training and Professional Development

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$15,037,660.00	\$15,291,574.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,329,234.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$15,037,660.00	\$17,236,462.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$32,274,122.82

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Grow NJ Kids Rollout and Incentives Administration

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$47,536.95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$47,536.95
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$14,092.03	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,092.03
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$4,433.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,433.79
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$66,062.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$66,062.77
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$494,808.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$494,808.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$560,870.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$560,870.77
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,000,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,560,870.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,560,870.77

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Independent Ratings for Program Quality Improvement through Grow NJ Kids

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$128,325.29
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$128,325.29
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$128,325.29
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$128,325.29

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Validating the Grow NJ Kids Tiered QRIS

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,992.45
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,992.45
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,992.45
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,992.45

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - Family Engagement and Health Connections

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$36,440.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,440.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$36,440.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,440.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$149,300.00	\$2,294,839.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,444,139.69
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$149,300.00	\$2,331,279.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,480,579.69
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$149,300.00	\$2,331,279.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,480,579.69

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 7 - Public Outreach and Awareness

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$356,614.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$356,614.05
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$356,614.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$356,614.05
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$356,614.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$356,614.05
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$2,124,937.00	\$2,124,937.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,249,874.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$2,124,937.00	\$2,481,551.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,606,488.05

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 8 - Data Systems

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$6,192.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,192.77
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$493,840.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$493,840.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$500,032.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500,032.77
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$500,032.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500,032.77
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,000,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,500,032.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,500,032.77

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 9 - Preschool-3rd Grade Initiative

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$94,683.18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$94,683.18
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$94,683.18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$94,683.18
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$94,683.18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$94,683.18
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$263,062.00	\$274,277.55	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$537,339.55
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$263,062.00	\$368,960.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$632,022.73

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 10 - Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$159,815.87	\$362,563.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$522,379.62
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$159,815.87	\$362,563.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$522,379.62

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 11 - Standards

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$999.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$999.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$999.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$999.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.